

20



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,872	02/16/2001	Rocky Stewart	BEAS-01033US4	6323
23910	7590	07/11/2005	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER, LLP FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111			PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 07/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

47

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/785,872

Applicant(s)

STEWART ET AL.

Examiner

Ashok B. Patel

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2005 and 05 May 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2, 7, 10, 12, 17 and 20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11, 13-16, 18, 19 and 21-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/5/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-32 are subject to examination. Claims 2,7,10,12,17 and 20 have been cancelled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/05/2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 3/7/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. : 102(e):

Applicant's argument:

Claim 1:

"Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Notani fails to teach a scheduler in collaboration workspace that schedules the flow of messages from transport to the router and from the router to the transport. As described above, it appears that Notani discloses that a global collaboration workspace can share data/objects between various entities in the collaboration and the workspace interfaces with the global collaboration managers, local system, etc., wherein objects can be placed into the global

Art Unit: 2154

collaboration workspace by one entity and retrieved by another entity. Applicant respectfully submits that this is a different process from a flow of messages, or scheduling of a flow of messages from transport to router, and from router to the transport within the collaboration workspace.”

Examiner’s response:

a. Examiner would like to begin with Fig. 10 of Notani in order to elucidate “a scheduler in collaboration workspace that schedules the flow of messages from transport to the router and from the router to the transport.”

b. Fig. 10, as it depicts inter-enterprise workflow with activities linking as explained in col. 13, line 6-24. These activities are, as Notani explains in col. 5, line 65 through col. 6, line 16, “The global collaboration designer can also allow designers to design the hub and spoke network for collaborations and design the events and messages of the collaboration. The global collaboration designer can integrate a standard object library and a standard component library for easy usage from within the global collaboration designer. The global collaboration designer can be used to create sophisticated multi-enterprise workflows with synchronous, asynchronous, sub-workflow, and-splits, or-splits, synchronization-joins, heterocast-splits, heterocast-joins etc. Global workflows and local workflows can both be created.”

c. These “objects”, as Notani teaches in col. 5, line 49-51, “Global collaboration workspace 30 stores data in the form of objects and can store Java Objects, CORBA objects or arbitrary byte arrays. “

Art Unit: 2154

d. Notani goes on building global collaboration workspace as being, as revealed in col. 5, line 41-44, "When used with in-memory slots, the global collaboration workspace 30 can be considered a fast, secure, in-memory object database, with security and messaging capabilities."

e. Notani now steps forward in explaining "assigning permissibility to these "object database" in col. 5, line 32-37, wherein Notani prescribes "The permissibilities can be assigned by-user-by-operation. The primary operations can be read, write, take, and subscribe."

f. Now that Notani has the collaborative Space ready, it is controlled by, as stated in col. 4, line 6-7, "In operation, the primary controller of the collaboration can be the GCM engine 8 of hub enterprise 2."

g. The processes now within and without, that is, between enterprises do interact for optimal decision making as shown in Fig. 4, col. 4, line 41-58.

Thus, Notani teaches elements of claim 1.

Claims 11, 21, 22, 31 and 32:

Applicant's argument:

Claims 21, 22, 31 and 32 have been amended similarly to Claim 1, to more clearly define the embodiment of the invention therein. For similar reasons as given above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are similarly neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Examiner's response:

Art Unit: 2154

Please refer to the response of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 11, 13-16, 18, 19, and 21-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Notani (US 6, 119, 149).

Referring to claim 1,

The reference teaches a collaboration hub for use with a collaboration system for handling messages (Fig. 2), comprising:

a transport for receiving messages from participants and sending messages to other participants (Fig. 2, col. 3, lines 59-66) ;

a router that validates each message received from a participant at the transport, examines the message to determine which other participant or participants the message should be delivered to, and stores the message for subsequent delivery via the transport (col.5, lines 32-37)

a scheduler that schedules the flow of messages between from the transport to the router, and from the router to the transport; (col.5, lines 17-29, Fig.2, elements 8, Fig. 6)

a manager that manages the flow of messages across components of collaboration hub; and, a repository that stores management data, wherein said management data is used by components of the collaboration hub to handle said messages. (Fig. 5, element 30, col.5, lines 19-32)

Referring to claims 3 and 4,

The reference teaches the collaboration hub of claim 1 further comprising a decoder that decodes messages received from said participants, wherein the decoder is plugged between the transport and the scheduler., and further comprising an encoder that encodes messages sent to other participants, wherein the encoder is plugged between the scheduler and the transport (col.6, lines 49 through col.7, line 33).

Referring to claims 5 and 6,

The reference teaches the collaboration hub of claim 1 further comprising router logic plug-ins that determine said other participants to whom messages should be sent, wherein the router logic plug-ins are plugged between the scheduler and the router, and further comprising filter logic plug-ins that determine whether to send a message to said other participants, wherein the filter logic plug-ins are plugged in between the router and the scheduler. (col.10, lines 53-65, Fig. 8, col.11, lines 21-33)

Referring to claim 8,

The reference teaches the collaboration hub of claim 1 further comprising business logic plug-ins that provide support for messages of various business protocols among the participants, wherein said business logic plug-ins are plugged in between the scheduler and the router. (col.7, lines 20-33)

Referring to claim 11,

The reference teaches a method for transferring messages between participants in a collaboration system (Fig.2), comprising the steps of:

receiving messages via a transport from participants and sending messages to other participants (Fig. 2, col.3, lines 59-66);

validating messages received at the transport by a router; including examining the message to determine which other participant or participants the message should be delivered to; storing messages by the router for delivery by the transport (col.5, lines 32-37);;

scheduling the flow of messages from the transport to the router and further scheduling messages from the router to the transport (col.5, lines 17-29, Fig. 2, elements 8, Fig.6);

managing the flow of messages across components of collaboration hub,

wherein said components comprise the transport, the router, and the scheduler; and,

storing management data in a repository wherein said management data is used by components of the collaboration hub to handle said messages.(Fig.5, element 30, col. 5, lines 19-32)

Referring to claims 13 and 14,

The reference teaches the method of claim 11 further comprising the step of decoding messages received from participants by a decoder, wherein the decoder is plugged between the transport and the scheduler, and further comprising the steps of encoding messages sent to said other participants, wherein the encoder is plugged between the scheduler and the transport (col.6, lines 49 through col.7, line 33)

Art Unit: 2154

Referring to claims 15 and 16,

The reference teaches the method of claim 11 further comprising the step of determining participants to whom messages should be sent by using router logic plug-ins, wherein router logic plug-ins are plugged between the scheduler and router, and further comprising the step of determining whether to send a message to a said other participants by using filter logic plug-ins, wherein said filter logic plug-ins are plugged in between the router and the scheduler.(col. 10, lines 53-65, Fig.8, col. 11, lines 21-33)

Referring to claim 18,

The reference teaches the method of claim 11 further comprising the step of providing support for messages of various business protocols among participants by using business logic plug-ins, wherein said business logic plug-ins are plugged in between the scheduler and the router.(col.7, lines 20-33)

Referring to claim 21,

The reference teaches a collaboration hub for use with a collaboration system (Fig.2), comprising:

a transport that receives messages from participants and sending messages to other participants, using an extensible collaboration protocol, wherein said extensible collaboration protocol provides ability to specify both information and business protocol; (Fig.2, col.3, lines 59-66, col. 6, line 49 through col. 7, line 19);

a router that validates messages received at the transport, examines the message to determine which other participant or participants the message should be delivered to, and stores messages for delivery by the transport (col.5, lines 32-37); and

a scheduler that schedules the flow of messages from the transport to the router, and from between the router to the transport.(col. 5, lines 17-29, Fig.2, elements 8, Fig.6)

Referring to claim 22,

The reference teaches a method for transferring messages between participants in a collaboration system (fig.2), comprising the steps of:

receiving messages via a transport from participants and sending the messages to other participants, using an extensible collaboration protocol, wherein said extensible collaboration protocol provides ability to specify both information and business protocol; (Fig.2, col.3, lines 59-66, col. 6, line 49 through col. 7, line 19);

validating messages received at the transport by a router, including examining the message to determine which other participant or participants the message should be delivered to, storing messages by the router for delivery by the transport (col.5, lines 32-37); and

scheduling the flow of messages from the transport to the router, and from the router to the transport. (col. 5, lines 17-29, Fig.2, elements 8, Fig.6)

Referring to claim 23,

The reference teaches a collaboration hub according to claim 1 further comprising said manager managing the flow of messages between the transport and participants.

.(Fig.5, element 30, col. 5, lines 19-32)

Referring to claim 24,

Art Unit: 2154

The reference teaches a method according to claim 11 further comprising the step of managing the flow of messages between the transport and participants using said manager. (Fig.5, element 30, col. 5, lines 19-32)

Referring to claim 25,

The reference teaches a collaboration hub according to claim 1 wherein said messages are transferred among said participants asynchronously. (col. 6, lines 4-9)

Referring to claim 26,

The reference teaches a method according to claim 11 wherein said messages are transferred among said participants asynchronously. (col. 6, lines 4-9)

Referring to claims 27 and 28,

The reference teaches a collaboration hub according to, claim 1 wherein said transport is configured to receive concurrent messages from participant, and wherein said transport is configured to send concurrent messages to participants, (Fig.4)

Referring to claims 29 and 30,

The reference teaches a method according to claim 11 wherein said transport is configured to receive concurrent messages from participants, and wherein said transport is configured to send concurrent messages to participants. (Fig.4)

Referring to claim 31,

The reference teaches a collaboration hub for use with a collaboration system (Fig.2), comprising:

 a transport that receives messages from a first participant and sends messages to a second participant, using an extensible collaboration protocol, wherein said

Art Unit: 2154

extensible collaboration protocol provides ability to specify both information and business protocol; (Fig.2, col.3, lines 59-66, col. 6, line 49 through col. 7, line 19);

a router that validates said messages received at the transport, examines the message to determine which other participant or participants the message should be delivered to, and stores said messages for delivery by the transport (col.5, lines 32-37);

a scheduler that schedules the flow of messages from the transport to the router and, from the router to the transport (col.5, lines 17-29, Fig.2, elements 8, Fig.6);

a manager for managing the flow of messages across components of collaboration hub; and, a repository for storing management data, wherein said management data is used by components of the collaboration hub to handle; said messages (Fig.5, element 30, col. 5, lines 19-32)

Referring to claims 32,

The reference teaches a method for transferring messages between participants in a collaboration system (Fig.2) , comprising the steps of:

receiving messages via a transport from a first participant and sending messages to a second participant, using an extensible collaboration protocol, wherein said extensible collaboration protocol provides ability to specify both information and business protocol; (Fig.2, col.3, lines 59-66, col. 6, line 49 through col. 7, line 19);

validating messages received at the transport by a router, including examining the message to determine which other participant or participants the message should be delivered to; storing messages by the router for delivery by the transport (col.5, lines 32-37);;

scheduling the flow of messages between the router and the transport (col.5, lines 17-29, Fig.2, elements 8, Fig.6);

managing the flow of messages across components of collaboration hub; and, storing management data in a repository, wherein said management data is used by components of the collaboration hub to handle said messages (Fig.5, element 30, col. 5, lines 19-32)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Notani (US 6, 119, 149) in view of Macready et al. (hereinafter Macready)(US 2002/0016759 A1)

Referring to claims 9 and 19,

Keeping in mind the teachings of the reference Notani as stated above, although the reference teaches business plug-ins that provide support for messages of various business protocols among participants (col.7, lines 20-33), the reference fails to teach wherein said business logic plug-ins include a RosettaNet plug-in. The reference Macready teaches "When combined with emerging XML standards for e-commerce (e.g. RosettaNet in the IT industry) the necessary "paperwork" for confirmed purchases can be generated by the computer and sent between all relevant parties (including the

Art Unit: 2154

consumer after a credit card check).", page 17, para.[0327]. Thereby, the reference teaches not only that the RosettaNet plug-in is configurable for companies wishing to trade with their trading partners using the RosettaNet XML message standards (known as Partner Interface Processes), but, also provides the motivation that the necessary "paperwork" for confirmed purchases can be generated by the computer and sent between all relevant parties. Therefore it would have been obvious to enhance the Notani's hub by adding a RosettaNet plug-in.

Conclusion

Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2154

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abp

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100